



Kahraman, S. (2015). An evaluation of an English language teaching education program in terms of teacher autonomy. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 2(2). 53-66.  
<http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/88/105>

## AN EVALUATION OF AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING EDUCATION PROGRAM IN TERMS OF TEACHER AUTONOMY

Sibel Kahraman

Gazi University

[sibelkahraman89@gmail.com](mailto:sibelkahraman89@gmail.com)

### Biodata

**Sibel Kahraman** is a research assistant at Gazi University, department of ELT. She received her master's degree from Gazi University and bachelor's degree from Hacettepe University. She is a PhD candidate interested in teacher education, teacher cognition and in-service education.

Copyright by Informascope. Material published and so copyrighted may not be published elsewhere without the written permission of IOJET.



## AN EVALUATION OF AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING EDUCATION PROGRAM IN TERMS OF TEACHER AUTONOMY

Sibel Kahraman

[sibelkahraman89@gmail.com](mailto:sibelkahraman89@gmail.com)

### Abstract

The present study aims to evaluate an English Language Teaching (ELT) Program of a university in Turkey in terms of teacher autonomy development. It attempts to do so by investigating course catalogues described in the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) of the program through the framework of European Profile for Language Teacher Education (EPLTE). The paper reports on the research findings from that analysis and the other qualitative analysis using a semi-structured interview conducted with seven teacher educators who have had experience with the ELT program. The results show that the ELT program has covered most of the aspects included in the checklist and the teacher educators shared positive views about the program in terms of autonomy development. They also gave some suggestions about the program and the context of the courses.

*Keywords:* Teacher autonomy, ELT program, European Profile for Language Teacher Education

### 1. Introduction

For more than two decades now, ‘autonomy’ has been a popular focus of discussion in second and foreign language teaching (Benson; 2011; Little, 1995; Littlewood, 1996). This popularization is not surprising as there has been a shift towards ‘learner-centered’ methods in language teaching. As a result of this shift, much research has been conducted on learner autonomy which can be defined in broadest terms as “the responsibility for all the decisions concerning all aspects of learning” (Chan, 2001, p. 505). There seems to be a general consensus that learners do not easily accept this responsibility for their own learning and they need to be mediated by someone else. In formal educational contexts, it is the role of the language teachers to provide learners with the appropriate tools and opportunities to enhance autonomy levels of their students (Little, 1995). At that point, much emphasis should be drawn upon the language teacher education programs as the target is to equip language teachers with the necessary qualifications through pre-service education.

Language teaching education programs need to be designed in lines with a reference framework which promotes the development of teacher autonomy by employing necessary knowledge and skills for student teachers to act in an autonomous way. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, Council of Europe, 2001) has been recently used for language teaching as it describes the capabilities of a language learner and promotes the learner autonomy with the use of portfolios (Reinders & Balcikanli, 2011). European Profile for Language Teacher Education (EPLTE) is a comprehensible guide developed by a team at the University of Southampton which was supported by the Council of Europe. The Profile supports the idea of teacher and learner autonomy and includes some strategies, skills and values in accordance with the dimensions of teacher autonomy.

In the 2006-2007 academic year, there has been a drastic change in the ELT programs of Turkey and the programs have been redesigned in compliance with the CEFR by Turkish

Higher Education Council. There has, however, been surprisingly little research into these ELT programs and their course contents regarding teacher autonomy. Therefore, it is the aim of this study to evaluate an ELT program in terms of teacher autonomy by using a checklist developed in line with the items in EPLTE (visit the website for more information about the profile <http://www.lang.soton.ac.uk/profile/report/MainReport.pdf>) and a semi-structured interview with teacher trainers.

## 2. Teacher Autonomy and Curriculum

The concept of learner autonomy has long been an area of interest for many researchers (Benson, 2001; Dam, 1995; Little, 1991; Sinclair, McGrath, & Lamb, 2000) since a project was reported to the Council of Europe by Holec (1981) on the field. As a result of these studies, the research on teacher autonomy has gained more importance for both researchers and educators. In recent years, teacher autonomy has been recognized as a major factor that affects the development of learner autonomy in foreign or second language teaching (Huang, 2005). This has increased the importance of teacher autonomy and much research has been conducted to illustrate that to enhance learner autonomy, teacher autonomy needs to be enhanced as well (Benson, 2001; Little, 1995; McGrath, 2000).

Despite the research studies on teacher autonomy, there has been little consensus on the definition of it as it is a multidimensional concept. Little (1995) was among the first to discuss the definition of teacher autonomy and argued that “genuinely successful teachers have always been autonomous in the sense of having a strong sense of personal responsibility for their teaching” (p. 179). However, this perspective has been criticized as it undermines the teachers’ influence over teaching and learning constraints (Mackenzie, 2002). A more comprehensive definition from McGrath (2000) views teacher autonomy in two different dimensions: teacher autonomy as self-directed action or development and teacher autonomy as freedom of control by others. There is a reciprocal relationship between these two dimensions; if teachers are self-directed, they have freedom from control by others or if teachers are free from control, they are self-directed (Benson, 2001). ‘Control’ is a key term in the definition of teacher autonomy as in the concept of ‘learner autonomy’. Similar views on ‘control’ dimension of teacher autonomy have been expressed by Powell and McGowan (1996) who argue that teacher autonomy is the control over their working environments and in the context of teacher education programs. In the same vein, Clement and Vandenberghe (2000) described teacher autonomy as a workplace condition which implies control over the working environment. Along with all the definitions above, Aoki’s (2002) analogy on teacher and learner autonomy has been widely recognized among the researchers. Aoki (2002, p. 111) defines teacher autonomy as:

‘If learner autonomy is the capacity, freedom, and/or responsibility to make choices concerning one’s own learning... teacher autonomy, by analogy, can be defined as the capacity, freedom, and/or responsibility to make choices concerning one’s own teaching.’

However, Aoki (2002) herself criticizes this definition as it falls behind to explain the effect of teacher autonomy on learner autonomy.

Different from all the definitions above, Smith (2000) proposed a new term ‘teacher-learner autonomy’. Smith (2000) defined the terms as “the ability to develop appropriate skills, knowledge and attitudes for oneself as a teacher, in corporation with others” (p. 1). This perspective can be regarded as the one which is most directly related to teacher education. Smith (2000) claims that the enhancement of teacher autonomy in relation to pedagogical and practical knowledge has an intrinsic value within teacher education

programs. Benson and Huang (2008), following Smith (2000), have favored a conception of teacher autonomy that “incorporates elements of professionalism, professional freedom and self-direction within the process of learning how to teach” (p. 435). It is clear from this conception that Benson and Huang (2008) suggest practical implications for both pre-service and in-service ELT education programs.

Huang’s (2005) definition of teacher autonomy as teachers’ willingness, capacity and freedom to take control of their own teaching and learning is directly related to practical implications suggested by Smith (2000). It is most appropriate for teacher educators and teacher education programs to focus directly on developing a willingness and capacity for self-directed teaching (Smith, 2000). Little (1995) also emphasized the prominence of teacher education programs in terms of developing student teachers’ awareness of learner autonomy by stating that prospective language teachers should be trained to appreciate the importance of learner autonomy. Language teachers are more likely to achieve learner autonomy in their own contexts if they are also trained to become autonomous learners. Therefore, it should be aim of the ELT education programs to develop awareness of student teachers’ their own autonomy and for their future teaching practices. Fostering teacher autonomy via education programs can be achieved by using various frameworks or portfolios such as EPLTE which have been designed to train language teachers with necessary qualifications.

### **3. The EPLTE**

The EPLTE is a frame of reference developed by a team at the University of Southampton led by Professor Michael Kelly and Dr. Michael Grenfell in 2004. The items in the Profile are based on the interviews with teacher educators around the world and findings from the analysis of various teacher education programs. The Profile is actually rooted in an earlier report, ‘The Training of Teachers of a Foreign Language: Developments in Europe’, which investigated the language teacher education programs of over 32 countries. There are 40 items in the Profile which can be used as a guideline while designing teacher education programs to equip language teachers with necessary qualifications and professional competences of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Kelly and Grenfell (2004) suggest that although the Profile is not a mandatory regulation for teacher education programs, it can be used as a checklist or guideline to analyze and improve their teacher education programs. This suggestion has led the researcher to use EPLTE as a checklist and criteria for the analysis of the program and the interviews conducted with teacher educators.

In a meeting of European Council in 2002, it was proposed that each European citizen should be taught two foreign languages along with their mother tongue. As a result of this, the importance of language teacher education is increasing not only in Europe, but also in an international level. Moreover, Kelly and Grenfell (2004) claim that the Profile is not only designed for European countries, but it can also be employed by other counties across Europe. The profile is comprised of 40 items divided into 4 sections: Structure; Knowledge and Understanding; Strategies and Skills; and Values. All the sections in the Profile interact to form a comprehensive guide to language teacher education programs in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Within these 40 items, there were some items which were closely related to the dimensions of teacher and learner autonomy. As a result of this inclusiveness and extensiveness, the EPLTE is used as a baseline for this research.

### **4. Methodology**

#### **4.1. Research Questions**

There are two main research questions in this study:

- 1) Does the ELT program contribute to train autonomous student teachers?

- 2) Does the ELT program equip student teachers with the necessary competences to train autonomous learners in their future contexts?

#### 4.2. Context of the Evaluation

Higher Education Council in Turkey is responsible for the organization, planning, recognition and supervision of all higher education institutions including the universities which train teachers. The Council also makes program reforms by updating the content of the courses offered by different departments in education faculties at Turkish universities. ELT programs have recently been reshaped in accordance with the changing social and educational necessities and developments. New ELT programs were introduced in the 2006-2007 academic year. This new program is based on both CEFR which provides a common ground for language programs to train autonomous teachers with professional development opportunities and European Portfolio for Student Teachers of English (EPOSTL) promoting professional growth through dialogue and reflection (Cosgun-Ogeyik, 2009).

The ELT program evaluated in this study has also been reshaped in the 2006-2007 reform. The program belongs to one of the universities located in the Central Anatolia in Turkey. At the time of the research, there were 1120 student teachers attending the program and 28 teacher trainers. The program provides student teachers with four-year education including theoretical and practical courses. In the first year of the program, student teachers are provided knowledge about how English works from different skills (e.g. contextual grammar, listening, speaking). In the following three years, the program mainly focuses on professional expertise (e.g. teaching methodology, teaching English to young learners, testing). The program also includes practice-based courses which give the student teachers opportunities to observe classes at primary and secondary schools (School Experience) and practice teaching at these schools (Teaching Practice). As the program is the main focus in this research, all the courses described in the ECTS are analyzed in terms of teacher autonomy development (See Appendix I for all the courses in the program).

ECTS can be described as a central tool which makes higher education more transparent and compatible across Europe. It allows learning experiences for students in different countries by offering greater student mobility and similar curriculum designs and credit systems. Thus, it gets easier for students to study abroad as the participating institutions share their course catalogues on the web, including detailed descriptions and objectives of the courses, regulations and services. The researcher also reached these course catalogues in the website of the related ELT department (See Appendix II for a sample course catalogue form).

#### 4.3. Participants

Along with the analysis of the ELT program, a semi-structured interview was conducted to gather the views of six teacher educators (F=2, M=4) in the department. While three of the teacher educators have had experience (changing from 2 to 9) with the current ELT program, the others have experienced (from 14 to 27 years) the current and the previous program. Some of the courses they have been lecturing at the department currently are *Teaching English to Young Learners*, *Second Language Acquisition*, *Teaching Language Skills*, *Special Teaching Methods*, *Advanced Reading and Listening*, *Oral Communication Skills* and *Teaching Practice*. (For the detailed information, see Table 1 below.)

Table 1. *Detailed Information about the Participants*

<i>Teacher Educators(TE)</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Years of experience</i>	<i>The courses lectured currently</i>
TE1	M	27	Teaching English to Young Learners, School Experience, Teaching Practice
TE2	M	25	Special Teaching Methods, Teaching Language Skills, School Experience, Teaching Practice
TE3	F	14	Approaches to ELT, Teaching English to Young Learners
TE4	M	9	Second Language Acquisition, Special Teaching Methods, Teaching Language Skills
TE5	M	3	Advanced Reading and Writing, Oral Communication Skills, Listening and Pronunciation
TE6	F	2	Teaching English to Young Learners, Effective Communication Skills, Approaches to ELT

#### 4.4. Evaluation Design

The main purpose of this evaluation is to reveal the aspects of an ELT program which needs to be maintained or improved for the development of student teachers' autonomous behaviors. As there has not been any attempt to develop a questionnaire or checklist for that kind of evaluation, the researcher employed a new evaluation checklist to analyze the ECTS of the program. In the same vein, the semi-structured interview conducted with teacher educators was designed in conformity with the same checklist. The items in the EPLTE developed by Kelly and Grenfell (2004) were the core of analysis. The aim was to analyze the items in this framework and gather the ones which were related to the dimensions of teacher autonomy. In order to be able to do so, the researcher had regular meetings with two experienced experts in the field and the items were analyzed one by one. Out of these 40 items in the framework, 8 items were chosen which were identified as the stages in the development of learner autonomy (Reinders, 2010). Reinders and Balcikanli (2011) also employed this framework including 8 stages for the evaluation of textbooks used commonly at ELT programs in terms of developing autonomy. Therefore, the stages in his model has been adopted in order to determine the items in the checklist. These stages are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. *The Eight Stages in the Development of Learner Autonomy* (Reinders, 2010, p. 46)

<i>Learning Stages</i>	<i>Examples</i>
Identifying needs	Learner experiences/difficulties in using the language.
Setting goals	Contextually determined, relatively flexible.
Planning learning	Contextually determined. Very flexible.
Selecting resources	Self-selection by learners.
Selecting learning strategies	Self-selection by learners.
Practice	Implementation (language use) and experimentation.
Monitoring progress	Self-monitoring, peer-feedback
Assessment and revision	Self-assessment, reflection



By taking these stages into consideration, the items were chosen from the EPLTE and they were employed both for the checklist to analyze the course catalogues and the semi-structured interview with the teacher educators. The items in the EPLTE are originally formed in sentence format. The researcher transformed the sentences into question format. The questions are as follows:

Does the program...

- 1) ... provide student teachers with an intercultural and multicultural context?
- 2) ... train student teachers in information and communication technology for pedagogical use in the classroom?
- 3) ... train student teachers in the ways of adapting teaching approaches to the individual needs of learners?
- 4) ... train student teachers in the critical evaluation, development and practical application of teaching materials and resources?
- 5) ... train student teachers in the development of reflective practice and self-evaluation?
- 6) ... train student teachers in 'how to learn'?
- 7) ... train student teachers in the application of various ways of recording learners' progress?
- 8) ... train student teachers in order to do action research?

#### **4.5. Data Collection Procedure**

Firstly, the ECTS of the program was obtained to reveal the aspects that support or need to be supported in terms of teacher autonomy. It should be noted here that the ECTS forms are created by lecturer of each course. Secondly, it seemed necessary to gather information from the teacher educators who can reflect on the aspects related to teacher autonomy and come up with new ideas. Six teacher educators were chosen for the semi-structured interviews to elicit their views and comments about the program and teacher autonomy dimension in the program. The reason why a semi-structured interview was used was to collect information as much as possible and to add and revise on previous questions depending on participants' responses (Barriball & While, 1994). This revision and expanding the questions give the opportunity for a more in-depth understanding of what teacher educators think. The participating teacher educators were provided with eight questions and asked to make related comments especially on the improvement of teacher autonomy dimensions. The interviews were conducted orally and tape-recorded and then transcribed by the researcher.

#### **4.6. Data Analysis**

Before the administration of the interview, in order to ensure the construct validity two experts were consulted about whether the items in the interview were appropriate for evaluating the program in terms of teacher autonomy. After the consultation, the experts did not offer any modifications.

The analysis of both course catalogues and semi-structured interviews with teacher educators were made through content analysis. That is to say, the qualitative analysis was employed by the researcher. The ECTS forms created by the lecturer of each course were analyzed in terms of course content, course objectives, learning outcomes and competences and the textbooks in the light of the questions in the checklist. For the each question, the researcher looked for the related elements and items throughout the course catalogues. For instance, the first question was intended for finding whether the program provides students teachers with an intercultural and multicultural context. As a result, the contents of the course catalogues were examined in order to find intercultural or multicultural elements. Moreover,



semi-structured interviews were conducted with one participant at a time, between 15 and 25 minutes. The audio taped and transcribed interviews were also analyzed by using the checklist and sample utterances from the teacher educators were given to exemplify the findings.

## 5. Findings and Discussion

The present study aims at evaluating an ELT program about whether it improves teacher autonomy and these teachers can become competent enough to train autonomous learners in their future contexts. In order to be able to seek answers for research questions, the course catalogues were analyzed and a semi-structured interview was conducted with six seven teacher educators in the department.

The first question in the checklist looked for whether the courses in the program provide student teachers with an intercultural and multicultural context. When the ECTS of the program was analyzed, it was seen that there were four courses which aimed at creating an awareness of the target culture in student teachers. These courses were *English Literature I*, *English Literature II*, *English in Mass Communication* (elective) and *Comparative Education*. The instructor of *English Literature I* described the learning outcomes and competences of that course as ‘to gain insight into literature in the framework of culture’. In *English in Mass Communication* course, the students were expected to analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of formal and informal means of mass communication in terms of cultural elements and its reflection on the language. These courses are of crucial importance for the student teachers as Sercu (2002, p. 72) claims ‘language-and-culture courses’ are needed for intercultural communicative competence and learner autonomy. Interview results also showed that the teacher educators think that the ELT program had some courses that enhance teaching intercultural elements. However, TE1 expressed that although the program had some related courses, the number of the courses was not sufficient enough to equip student teachers with intercultural communicative competences. Moreover, TE4 claimed that the program should promote learning other cultures autonomously as Sercu (2002) also implied that competences need to be acquired to learn about other cultures autonomously.

When it comes to the second question which seeks whether the program trains student teachers in information and communication technology for pedagogical use in the classroom, it was concluded that most of the courses in the program required using that technology for the course presentations and micro teaching. There were two courses in the program, *Computing Skills I* and *II*, which were not related to pedagogical competences but rather aimed at making use of office programs efficiently. After the interview with the TE2, the researcher was informed about a new elective course which would be held in the next academic year. The course is called *Technological Applications in ELT* which would aim at making student teachers effective users of web 2.0 technologies for pedagogical aims. One of the objectives of the course identified by the instructor was to develop an awareness of the use of web 2.0 technologies outside the classrooms in the context of ‘autonomous learning’, ‘individualized learning’ and ‘learning ecologies’. This is an appreciated reform for the program as many researchers (Bhattacharya & Chauhan, 2010; Littlewood, 1997; Schwienhorst, 2003) claim that it is an opportunity to use information and communication technologies as means to promote and develop autonomous teaching and learning skills.

The third question in the checklist and interview asked whether the program trains student teachers in the ways of adapting teaching approaches to the individual needs of learners. All the teacher educators stated that their program definitely focused on student teachers’ teaching skills. TE6 had the following views:

*'I am also a graduate of that department. Although we were not trained with the same program employed currently, the aim was the same. We were taught to become aware of the individual needs of our learners and find ways to develop our teaching for their needs. This requires total autonomy for future teaching contexts.'*

The courses in the program were in the step with the comments of the teacher educators. There were many courses which aim at developing pedagogical competences of the student teachers to adapt their teaching to the individual needs of their students. The objective of the course *Special Teaching Methods I* was stated as 'to embellish the students with the necessary knowledge and skills to be able to examine and modify texts for the individual needs of the students'. Moreover, there was a course called *Special Education* which focused on the training of students with special needs. There were more courses such as *Teaching English to Young Learners*, *Teaching Language Skills*, *ELT Methodology*, *Approaches to ELT* all of which somehow took the individual needs into consideration. As Reinders (2010) also stated it is crucial for language teachers to know how learners differ in their capacity to process, store, and retrieve information; how they differ in terms of age, intelligence, beliefs about language learning; and how they differ in their approaches to learning. Then it is the task of teacher education programs to train teachers accordingly for autonomous learning and teaching environments.

Following question 3, the fourth question looked for the answers whether the ELT program trains student teachers in the critical evaluation, development and practical application of teaching materials and resources. The interviews with teacher educators showed that the student teachers in the department were always encouraged to come up with ideas and implementations of materials development and design. TE3 commented as:

*'In my Teaching English to Young Learners classes, I sometimes get amazed at the materials our students design. Most of the time, they are really creative and make use of authentic materials for their micro teaching. You should see the walls; there are traces of these materials.'*

While almost all the pedagogical competence courses such as *Teaching English to Young Learners* or *Special Teaching Methods* emphasized the importance of material development, the program offered two courses specifically given for that aim, *Materials Adaptation and Evaluation* and *Educational Technologies and Material Design*. After completing these courses, the students were expected to evaluate syllabuses and teaching materials; prepare and use teaching materials and make the necessary adaptations. These tasks identified in the learning outcomes and competences of the courses are entirely autonomous behaviors expected from student teachers. All the teacher educators interviewed claimed that their student teachers became ready to do so after graduation. As Reinders and Balcikanli (2011) also emphasized, choosing appropriate materials for both learners and student teachers is crucial for promoting autonomy.

The next question targeted the answer for whether the ELT program trains student teachers in the development of reflective practice and self-evaluation. This question was directly related to teacher autonomy and employed to see if the student teachers are encouraged to reflect on their teaching. Little (1991) argued that autonomy in language learning depends on the development and exercise of a capacity for critical reflection. About this dimension of teacher autonomy, TE4 commented as follows:

*'Actually the program does not have any course specifically designed for that aim. However, the students in my courses are always encouraged to do reflection as it is a legitimate goal of my training in the courses. They are asked to write reflective journals at the end of each class and reflect on what they learnt or did not learn in the class.'*

Another teacher educator claimed that the program needed to have such courses to build an initial baseline for the professional development of the student teachers in their future contexts. The contents of the course catalogues indicated by the instructors at the department did not show any signs of developing reflective practices or self-evaluation. That is to say, the instructors may be employing some activities to do reflection in their courses, yet, it seems that this is not the main aim of any course. In one of the courses, *Special Teaching Methods*, a textbook called as ‘Tasks for Teacher Education: A Reflective Approach’ by Tanner and Green (1998) is used. However, as textbook evaluation is not in the scope of our evaluation, it would not be reasonable to say something about the content of the book.

In question 6, the aim was to find whether the ELT program trains student teachers in ‘how to learn’. If an autonomous teacher wants to train autonomous language learners, he/she should be able to train his/her learners on ‘how to learn’ (Benson, 2011). In the ELT program, almost all the courses focused on ‘how to teach’. When the course objectives, learning outcomes and competences were analyzed, it was found out that the courses in the ECTS did not include any activities or objectives directly related to learner training. Along the same line, the teacher educators in the interviews told the researcher that they accept these student teachers as if they know how to learn. One of the teacher educators commented as:

*‘To face the truth, when our student teachers graduate, they may have to train their students on how to learn. When I was teaching English at the preparatory school, I remember my students used to ask me how to learn English. They did not know what to do; they did not have any learning strategies and were not aware of their learning styles.’*

Even though the program did not include any courses specifically designed for learner training, in *Teaching Principles and Methods* course the students were expected to explain learning strategies at the end of the course.

Question 7 sought answers for whether the program trains student teachers in the application of various ways of recording learners’ progress. In the famous analogy of Aoki (2002), it was claimed that autonomous teachers are the ones who take control of their teaching. That is to say, an autonomous teacher should evaluate both his/her teaching and students’ learning. In the ELT program, one of the objectives was to select and use teaching materials to follow students’ progress in *Testing and Evaluation* course. This course was lectured in Turkish by the faculty in the Educational Sciences. In addition to that course, the program also included one more course, *Testing and Evaluation in ELT*. After completing that course, the students are expected to understand and be aware of alternative assessment types and evaluation of students’ success. TE1 shared his views:

*‘For our department, the primary goal is to be able to train successful teachers. One of the primary objectives that we impose upon our student teachers is to become responsible for their teaching and students. In all the methodological courses, we always talk about how to keep track of the students.’*

The last question in the interview and the checklist asked whether the ELT program trains student teachers in order to do action research. As a part of reflective model by Wallace (1991), the teachers who can achieve to reflect on their teaching and act in an autonomous way know how to do action research. They are both teachers and researchers of their classrooms. Out of 59 courses in the program, there was only one course, *Scientific Research Methods*, which aimed to teach scientific research methods, techniques and applications to the student teachers. However, four of the teacher educators interviewed did not find the number of these courses enough for the students teachers. TE 2 commented as:

*‘As the aim is to train successful teachers, the program mostly focuses on teacher training in a more pedagogical way. However, it is better to keep in mind that we are also under the responsibility of preparing our students as both teachers and researchers.’*

Overall, analyzing the course catalogues in the ECTS and teacher educators’ perspectives on the program, there are some common noteworthy thoughts shared by all six of them. There seems to be a feeling among teacher educators that the ELT program puts more emphasis on student teachers’ pedagogic competence and more courses are needed to develop their research competences. A common opinion among teacher educators was to include some courses about learner training and research. The results also show that the courses of the program evaluated in this study focused on the stages of autonomy suggested by Reinders (2010). As the motive behind this study was to evaluate the ELT program in terms of teacher autonomy, it would be reasonable to probe into whether the course objectives, learning competences or outcomes are actually covered by the teacher educators for future research.

## **6. Concluding Remarks**

The present study set out to evaluate an ELT program in terms of teacher autonomy development by using the EPLTE as a guideline. There are two main research questions sought to answer in the study, one covering areas regarding the student teachers’ autonomy development, while the other mainly focusing on the competences the student teachers have to foster their students’ autonomy. The findings reveal that the ECTS of the program supports the autonomy development for the student teachers from many aspects. The student teachers are encouraged to learn about the target culture autonomously, to effectively use information and communication technologies for pedagogical purposes and to adapt to the individual needs of the students in the classroom. However, some aspects related to teaching ‘how to learn’ and doing research are not included in specifically designed courses for these purposes. Furthermore, teacher educators with whom semi-structured interviews are conducted agree with the findings of the ECTS analysis. They have given some suggestions such as including more research based courses or supporting reflective practices.

As autonomy has been an indispensable part of teacher and learner training, this has necessitated the restructuring of teacher education programs (Cakir & Balcikanli, 2012). The ELT program evaluated in this study has been reshaped in the 2006-2007 academic year in accordance with the CEFR. As a requirement of CEFR, the findings show that the program has some components of learner and teacher autonomy such as intercultural awareness, technology use and material selection. This study has been conducted on just one ELT program applied in one of the Turkish universities. The same evaluation can be done with more programs and teacher educators’ views in order to reach broader and more definite conclusions on the field. For a more in-depth analysis of the ELT programs, the teaching and learning processes can be observed as a necessity of formal evaluation.

## References

- Aoki, N. (2002). Aspects of teacher autonomy: Capacity, freedom, and responsibility. In P. Benson, & S. Toogood (Eds), *Learner autonomy 7: Challenges to research and practice* (pp. 110–124). Dublin: Authentik.
- Barriball, K. L., & While, A. (1994). Collecting data using a semi-structured interview: A discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19, 328-335.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and researching autonomy*. Britain: Pearson.
- Benson, P., & Huang, J. (2008). Autonomy in the transition from foreign language: Learning to foreign language teaching. *D.E.L.T.A.*, 24, 421–439.
- Bhattacharya, A., & Chauhan, K. (2010). Augmenting learner autonomy through blogging. *ELT Journal*, 64(4), 376–384.
- Cakir, A., & Balcikanli, C. (2012). The use of the EPOSTL to foster teacher autonomy: ELT student teachers' and teacher trainers' views. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(3), 1–16.
- Chan, V. (2001). Readiness for learner autonomy: What do our learners tell us? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(4), 505–518.
- Clement, M. & Vandenberghe, R. (2000). Teachers' professional development: A solitary or collegial (ad)venture? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(1), 81–101.
- Cosgun-Ogeyik, M. (2009). Evaluation of English Language Teaching Education Curriculum by Student Teachers. *Insan ve Toplum*, 9(1), 42–57.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dam, L. (1995). *Learner autonomy 3: From theory to classroom practice*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Huang, J. (2005). Teacher autonomy in language learning: A review of the research. In K. R. Katyal, H. C. Lam, & X. J. Ding (Eds), *Research Studies Education* (pp. 203–218). Faculty of Education, the University of Hong Kong.
- Kelly, M., & Grenfell, M. (2004). *European Profile for Language Teacher Education: A frame of reference*. University of Southampton.



- Little, D. (1991) *Autonomy: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System*, 23(2), 175–182.
- Littlewood, W. (1996). “Autonomy”: An autonomy and a framework. *System*, 24(4), 427–435.
- Mackenzie, A. (2002). Changing contexts: Connecting teacher autonomy and institutional development. In A.S. Mackenzie & E. McCafferty (Eds.), *Developing autonomy: Proceedings of the JALT CUE Conference 2001* (pp. 223–32). Tokyo: The Japan Association for Language Teaching College and University Educators Special Interest Group.
- McGrath, I. (2000). Teacher autonomy. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath, & T. Lamb (Eds), *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions* (pp. 100–110). Harlow: Longman.
- Powell, J. H., & McGowan, T. M. (1996). In search of autonomy: Teachers’ aspirations and expectations from a school-university collaborative. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12(3), 249–260.
- Reinders, H. (2010). Towards a classroom pedagogy for learner autonomy: A framework of independent language learning skills. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(5), 40–55.
- Reinders, H., & Balcikanli, C. (2011). Learning to foster autonomy: The role of teacher education materials. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, 2(1), 15–25.
- Sercu, L. (2002). Autonomous learning and the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence: Some implications for course development. *Language culture and curriculum*, 15(1), 61–74.
- Schwienhorst, K. (2003). Learner autonomy and tandem learning: Putting principles into practice in synchronous and asynchronous telecommunications environments. *Computer assisted language learning*, 16(5), 427–443.
- Sinclair, B., McGrath I., & Lamb, T. (2000). *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions*. London: Longman.
- Smith, R. C. (2000). Starting with ourselves: Teacher-learner autonomy in language learning. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath, & T. Lamb (Eds), *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions* (pp. 89–99). Harlow: Longman.
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers*. UK: Bell & Bain.



## **Appendix I**

### **The courses in the ELT Program**

Contextual Grammar I/II	Teaching Principles and Methods
Advanced Reading and Writing I/II	History of Turkish Education
Listening and Pronunciation I/II	Language Acquisition
Computing Skills I/II	Special Teaching Methods
Effective Communication Skills	Educational Technologies and Material Design
Introduction to Educational Sciences	Scientific Research Methods
Oral Communication Skills I/II	Teaching English to Young Learners I/II
Turkish Writing Expression	ELT Methodology
Lexical Competence	Teaching Language Skills I/II
Educational Psychology	Literature and Language Teaching I/II
Turkish Oral Expression	Second Foreign Language I/II/III
English Literature I/II	Testing and Evaluation
Linguistics I/II	Social Service
Approached to ELT I/II	History of Turkish Republic I/II
English-Turkish Translation	Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and Development
Turkish-English Translation	Special Education
Oral Expression and Public Speaking	English Language Testing and Evaluation
School Observation	Teaching Practice
Cognitive Strategies	Semantics and Language Teaching
Mass Media Communication	Pragmatics and Language Teaching
Comparative Education	Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching
Drama	Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching
Classroom Management	

## Appendix II

## Sample Course Catalogue Form of the ELT Program

Course Title:							<u>English Language Teaching (ELT)</u>		
<u>Semester</u>	<u>Teaching Methods</u>							<u>Credits</u>	
	<u>Lecture</u>	<u>Recite</u>	<u>Lab.</u>			<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Credit</u>	ECTS Credit
<u>Language</u>									
<u>Compulsory / Elective</u>									
<u>Prerequisites</u>									
<u>Course Contents</u>									
Course Objectives									
Learning Outcomes and Competences									
Textbook and /or References									
Assessment Criteria							<i>If any, mark as (X)</i>	Percent (%)	
	Midterm Exams								
	Final Exam								
Instructors									
Week	Subject								